



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,629	11/24/2003	Preston F. Crow	EMC-99-027DIV1	4258

24227 7590 03/15/2005

EMC CORPORATION  
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL  
176 SOUTH STREET  
HOPKINTON, MA 01748

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/720,629	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CROW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anh Ly	<b>Art Unit</b> 2162	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Amendment filed on 11/03/2004.
2. Claims 16-25 are pending in this Application.

### *Double Patenting*

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 16 and 21 of the instant application are anticipated by patent 6,654,772 claim 1, in that claim 1 of the patent contains all limitations of claims 16 and 21 of the instant application. Claims 16 and 21 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claims as such are unpatentable for obvious-type double patenting.

“Generally, an obviousness-type double patenting analysis entails two steps. First, as a matter of law, a court construes the claims in the earlier patent and the claims in the later patent and determines the differences. *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Gypsum Co.*, 195 F.3d 1322, 52 USPQ2d 1590, 1593 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Second, the court determines whether the differences in subject matter between the two claims render the claims patentably distinct. *Id.* At 1327, 52 USPQ2d at 1595. A later claim that is not patentably distinct from an earlier claims in a commonly owned patent is invalid for obvious-type double patenting. In *Re Berg*, 140 F. 3r 1428, 1431, 46 USPQ2d 1226, 1229 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In *re Longi*, 759 F. 2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In *re Berg*, 140 F. 3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within the genus).” *“ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC.*, United States Court of Appeals for the

Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001)..

“The only other difference between claim 1 of the ‘213 patent and claim 7 of the ‘549 patent is that the former is directed to humans while the latter is directed to animals. Humans are a species of animal genus. Our case law firmly establishes that a later genus claim limitation is anticipated by, and therefore not patentably distinct from, an earlier species claim. In re Berg, 140 F. 3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F. 3d 1046, 1053, 29 USPQ2d 2010, 2016 (Fed. Cir 1993); In re Gosteli, 872 F. 2d 1008, 1010, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1616 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Titanium Metals Corp. v Banner, 778 F. 2d 775, 782, 227 USPQ 773, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F. 2d at 944, 214 USPQ at 767 (C.C.P.A. 1982). “ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR HEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).”


**Contact Information**


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY   
MAR. 14<sup>th</sup>, 2005